UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,972	06/29/2001	Yngve Ternulf	0104-0345P	5129

2292 7590 02/04/2004

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER	
YANG, RYAN R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	10

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/856,972	Applicant(s) TERNULF ET AL.	
	Examiner Ryan R Yang	Art Unit 2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 November 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 11/10/2003. This action is final.

2. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 12 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 11/10/2003, claims 1-11 were amended and claims 12-21 were added.

3. This application is a 371 of PCT/SE98/02183 filed 11/30/1998.

4. The present title of the invention is "Method for inserting objects into a working area in a computer application" as filed originally.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-16, 18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankin et al. (5,625,567) in view of Wright et al. (5,051,898).

As per claim 1, Mankin et al., hereinafter Mankin, discloses a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area on a computer display, comprising the step of:

Displaying an existing network in said working area (Figure 1);

identifying at least one subarea of the working area where an object is insertable into said network (Figure 9 "First, in step 80 the system determines the terminal type for

each net which is a terminal of the partition. Each port at such terminals with respect to a given partition is examined to determine whether the port is an input, output, tristate or bidirectional port in step 82", column 8, line 65- column 9, line 2);

identifying what type of object that can be inserted into the network in said subarea ("After determining the terminal type, the system, in step 84 (FIG. 9), adds tri enable gates, if appropriate. If there are K tristate gates connected together, the K tristate enable input signals going into each tristate gate are connected into an N input gate of a particular type as are identified as available in the technology file", column 4, line 54-56);

visually indicating said at least one subarea (Figure 1 14);

displaying an extended network where an additional object of the type that is indicated in association with the selected subarea is inserted into the selected subarea (Figure 13).

Mankin discloses a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area. It is noted Mankin does not explicitly disclose

visually Indicating said object type in association with each subarea; and

receiving input from the user selecting one of said at least one subarea,

however, this is known in the art as taught by Wright et al., hereafter Wright. Wright discloses a method of inserting objects in which "the slot parameter indication for the appropriate object kinds for that slot includes the object kind representing by the icon 16", column 4, line 54-56 and "It indicates to the user that an object of the same kind as shown in FIG. 1 can be inserted into slot 26", column 4, line 52-54).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Wright into Mankin because Mankin discloses a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area and Wright discloses the objects can be visually recognized in order to help easier identifying and selection of the objects.

7. As per claim 2, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Wright further discloses the step of identifying at least one subarea of the working area where an object is insertable into said network comprises the step of graphically outlining said at least one subarea (Figure 2 26).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Wright into Mankin because Mankin discloses a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area and Wright discloses the objects can be visually recognized in order to help easier identifying and selection of the objects.

8. As per claim 3, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of claims 1 or 2, supra, and Wright further discloses the identification of said at least one subarea is activatable and deactivatable by the user ("FIG. 2 represents a state of completed action which was previous carried out **by "clicking" an icon 16** and inserting it in slot", column 4, line 50-52, and "If an attempt were to be made to insert an object of an impermissible data kind in a slot, an error message is generated", column 4, line 56-59, thus, indicating the selected area is activated).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Wright into Mankin because Mankin discloses a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area and Wright discloses the objects can be visually recognized in order to help easier identifying and selection of the objects.

9. As per claim 4, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Wright further discloses wherein input from the user is received using a pointing device ("The run button may also be used to invoke the tool by positioning of a user-controlled pointing device", column 2, line 41-43).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Wright into Mankin because Mankin discloses a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area and Wright discloses the objects can be visually recognized in order to help easier identifying and selection of the objects.

10. As per claim 5, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 4, supra, and Wright further discloses the pointing device is in electronic contact with the computer application and controls a cursor on the display ("The run button may also be used to invoke the tool by positioning of a user-controlled pointing device to place an indicator on the viewing screen over the run button, followed by invocation of a signal (a "click") on the pointing device", column 2, line 41-45, and "The buttons are invoked by clicking the feature, that is, placing a cursor

at the button and pressing an execute key", column 5, line 38-40, thus, indicating the pointing device is in electronic contact with the computer application and controls a cursor).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Wright into Mankin because Mankin discloses a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area and Wright discloses the objects can be visually recognized in order to help easier identifying and selection of the objects.

10. As per claim 7, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 4, supra, and Wright further discloses the step of indicating an object type in association with each subarea comprises the step of displaying a symbol representing said object type in connection to said subarea (Figure 2 120 for subarea 24 and 116 for subarea 26).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Wright into Mankin because Mankin discloses a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area and Wright discloses the objects can be visually recognized in order to help easier identifying and selection of the objects.

11. As per claim 9, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Wright further discloses the object types represent various physical items that are inserted into the working area to create said network ("It indicates to the user that an object of the same kind as shown in FIG. 1

can be inserted into slot 26, and that the slot parameter indication for the appropriate object kinds for that slot includes the object kind represented by the icon 16", column 4, line 52-56).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Wright into Mankin because Mankin discloses a method for creating a logical network by inserting a plurality of objects into a working area and Wright discloses the objects can be visually recognized in order to help easier identifying and selection of the objects.

12. As per claim 10, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 9 supra, and Mankin further discloses the network represents a system for automation ("FIG. 3 shows a circuit design in which input ports 20, input pads 22, output pads 24 and output ports 26 have been added automatically without any logic being mapped to the pads", column 1, line 49-52)

13. As per claim 11, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1 supra, and further discloses computer-readable medium, on which is stored instructions for one or several general purpose computers, comprising means for enabling said one or said several computers to perform the steps of the method according to claim 1 (Since the invention by Mankin and Wright are both computer program useful in a computer system, it is inherent the program is stored in a computer-readable medium to be executed on a computer).

14. Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankin et al. and Wright et al. (5,051,898), and further in view of Cariffe et al. (6,201,548).

As per claim 6, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 4 or 5, supra.

Mankin and Wright discloses a method for inserting an object into a working area. It is noted that Mankin and Wright do not explicitly disclose the step of identifying at least one subarea of the working area where an object is insertable into said network comprises the step of graphically outlining said subarea when the cursor is moved into said subarea, however, this is known in the art as taught by Cariffe et al., hereinafter Cariffe. Cariffe discloses an image editing method in which a portion of the image is outlined when the cursor is moved into the subarea (column 1, line 16-18).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Cariffe into Mankin and Wright because Mankin and Wright disclose a method for inserting an object into a working area and Cariffe discloses the area of interest the cursor moves into is outlined in order for it to be easily distinguished from the rest of the area.

15. Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankin et al. and Wright et al. (5,051,898) and further in view of Hernandez et al. (4,686,522).

As per claim 8, Mankin and Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 5, supra.

Mankin and Wright disclose a method for inserting an object into a working area. It is noted that Mankin and Wright do not explicitly disclose the step of indicating an object type in association with each subarea comprises the step of changing the appearance of the cursor, however, this is known in the art as taught by Hernandez et al., hereinafter Hernandez. Hernandez discloses a method of editing graphics objects in which the appearance of the cursor changes when associated with a region ("while only one cursor is displayed, its appearance is changed from a blinking cursor to a pointing cursor during the process which is selecting the particular action", column 2, line 51-54).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hernandez into Mankin and Wright because Mankin and Wright disclose a method for inserting an object into a working area and Hernandez discloses appearance of the cursor changes when associated with a region in order to easily edit a graphical object.

16. As per claims 12-21, since they are directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claims 1-10, and therefore are similarly rejected as claims 1-10, respectively.

Regarding the "means plus function" language, the means refer to the software methods executed on generically disclosed hardware explicitly disclosed by Mankin, Wright, Cariffe and Hernandez. It is further noted that both software and hardware means are functionally equivalent.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Ryan Yang** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-6133**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Michael Razavi**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4713**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 305-47000377.

Ryan Yang
February 2, 2004

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600